

SUPPORT FOR THE AMENDMENT

Support for the amendment to claim 9 is found in claims 24 and 30 as originally presented. No new issues would be raised by entry of applicants' amendment as applicants have merely introduced the limitations from existing dependent claims, into independent claim 9.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 7, 9 and 17-23, 25-29 and 31 will now be active in this application.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

The claimed invention is directed to skin and hair treatment methods.

Applicants wish to thank examiner Yu for the helpful and courteous discussions held with their U.S. representative on March 27 and April 2, 2008. At that time, the examiner indicated that claims 7 and 17-21 were allowable but that the examiner expressed concerns regarding claim 9 in view of Robbins et al. U.S. 4,626,429. The following is intended to expand upon the discussion with the examiner.

Claims 9, 23, 25-29 and 31

The embodiment of the claimed invention is directed to a method of remedying excessive hair dryness or improving touch feel of the hair by applying a hair composition comprising a diamide and at least one of an anionic surfactant and a non-ionic surfactant.

Robbins et al. describes a hair conditioning composition comprising a mononeoalkanoamide (see abstract). The composition is described as providing hair conditioning properties which are often equal to or better than those of quaternary ammonium salts (column 1, lines 47-51). A disclosed advantage of the conditioning amides is that they are easily removed from hair by conventional shampoos of both anionic and nonionic types,

so that objectionable conditioner build-up is easily avoided (column 10, lines 4-9). A hair treatment method in which the composition contains both a diamide derivative and at least one of an anionic surfactant or a non-ionic surfactant is not disclosed.

In contrast, the invention of claim 9 is directed to a hair treatment method in which a composition comprising a diamide and at least one of an anionic surfactant or a non-ionic surfactant is applied. Applicants note that claim 9 has been amended to recite a composition comprising a diamide **and at least one of an anionic surfactant or a non-ionic surfactant**.

Applicants respectfully submit that it would not have been obvious to include either of an anionic surfactant or a non-ionic surfactant in the diamide containing composition of Robbins et al. as the reference notes that the neoalkyl diamide **is easily removed** by each of an anionic surfactant and a non-ionic surfactant. Robbins et al. identify that the conditioning amides produce a "coating" of the hair (column 9, lines 54-56). Therefore a composition containing anionic and non-ionic surfactants, surfactants identified as having an effect of **removing neoalkyl diamide from hair**, would not be obvious. Such a composition would be on its face non-obvious, as an anionic and non-ionic surfactant would destroy the purpose of the reference of depositing neoalkyl diamide on the hair surface. Accordingly the invention of claims 9 23, 25-29 and 31 is not obvious over Robbins et al.

Applicants submit that this application is now in condition for allowance and early notification of such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon



Richard L. Chinn, Ph.D.
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,305

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
RLC:aif